REMARKS

Claims 16-30 remain pending in this application. None of the claims have been amended in this response. .

Claims 20 and 21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 16-19, 22, 23, 25, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by *Seppanen* (EP 0781064).

Claims 24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Seppanen* (EP 0781064).

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Seppanen* (EP 0781064) in view of *Hamalainen et al.* (US 2002/0057667).

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Seppanen* (EP 0781064) in view of *Hamalainen et al.* (US 2002/0057667) and further in view of *Kristnamurthi et al.* (US 2001/0001089). Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Specifically, none of the cited art, alone or in combination, recite, among other things, the features of "supporting at least one first service and one second service by the radio device," along with the feature of having updated first and second lists with respect to each service as recited in claim 16. Under this configuration, a list of datasets allocated to a service can be provided immediately after the occurrence of a connection, and is made available to the base stations offering the desired service simply by selecting the required service given a connection requiring a specific service. In addition, an updated image of the currently supported services is generated automatically and independently of entries of the user by updating the lists given a modification of the data of the base stations.

In contrast, *Seppanen* discloses a multimode mobile terminal for the communication via different mobile radio networks whereby the multimode mobile terminal has a single prioritized list of all available networks. The selection of a network and the resultant access to the network are specified by the user, whereby a first access type is provided which is an automatic access requiring little or no user involvement; a second access type is provided which enables access to a network that is specified by the user and a third access type is provided wherein, according to a

service that is specified by the user and that is supported by at least one network, access is enabled to one of these networks (col. 5, lines 24 to 30). With regard to the third access type, the user receives one list of all available services of all networks (col. 5 line 22; col. 6, lines 20 to 23). In the single list, all networks are stored in the form of datasets allocated to the networks (col. 14, line 14-27; FIG. 24). However, *Seppanen* does not teach listing specific services provided by a respective network and storing/updating them with respect to the datasets given to the mobile terminal.

And regarding the updating feature, the mobile terminal of *Seppanen* initiates a search for additional networks supporting the specified service if the networks that are stored in the single list do not support the specified service. However, the present claims recited that an updating occurs when the data of the base stations is modified, i.e. when a base station no longer supports a service due to the system, for example, and the signaling of the support of the service no longer occurs or when the mobile subscriber leaves the coverage of a base station. Thus all this is automatically detected and the lists are correspondingly updated. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn.

The *Hamalainen* and *Kristnamurthi* are also silent with regard to these features, and the references further do not solve the deficiencies of *Seppanen* for the reasons discussed above. Furthermore, Applicants submit that the combination of *Seppanen* with *Hamalainen* and *Kristnamurthi* is improper as the combination of the references would not produce the claimed invention, and that the combination is based on impermissible hindsight. The SMS configuration of *Kristnamurthi* is based on received calls within the same cell, and thus would not rely on the teaching of *Seppanen*. Similarly, the configuration of *Hamalainen* relies on data transfer rates, and not through candidate scan lists.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16-30 of the present application are both novel and non-obvious over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 §102 and §103 be withdrawn and a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (115426-270) on the account statement.

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY _____

Peter Zura
Reg. No. 48,196
Customer No.: 29177
Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: September 19, 2004